

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/757,314	01/14/2004	Mohammed Mahbubur Rahman	WJT08-0053 (JSF001-0002)	3500
7590 07/12/2005		5	EXAMINER	
William J Tuo 14431 Goliad I			HAM, SEUNGSOOK	
Box #8			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Malakoff, TX 75148			2817	
			DATE MAILED: 07/12/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Amiliaantia			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summan	10/757,314	RAHMAN ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Seungsook Ham	2817			
The MAILING DATE of this communication apperiod for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a re If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perio Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	I. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17	May 2005.				
<u> </u>	is action is non-final.				
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrest is/are allowed. 5) Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and subject to restriction and subject to restriction.	rawn from consideration.	· Ye			
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examination The drawing(s) filed on 14 January 2004 is/ar Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction The oath or declaration is objected to by the It	re: a) \square accepted or b) \square objected a drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ection is required if the drawing(s) is objection	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). lected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applicati iority documents have been receive au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)					
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 8) 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:				

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The phrase, "a third resonator located on a third layer of dielectric material" should be deleted throughout the specification (including abstract).

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 8 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claims 8 and 20, "the remainder of the resonators are on the top layer and in microstripline form" appears to be misleading since resonators themselves are in stripline form only, but other elements in the filter/resonator circuits are in microstripline form. Moreover, "each combline resonator" is confusing as to which resonator referring to.

It appears that the applicant intended to cancel claims 8 and 10 (see REMARKS, p. 8, first paragraph, and p. 9 fifth paragraph), however, the Amendment filed on 5/17/05 (see pp. 4 and 6) still contains claims 8 and 20 as "Currently Amended."

Application/Control Number: 10/757,314

Art Unit: 2817

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peters (US '259) in view of Liang et al. (US 6,492,883, insofar as understood).

Peters (figs. 4A-4C) discloses a multilayer filter comprising: a first resonator 208a on a first dielectric layer 202c; a second resonator 206 coupled to the first resonator on a second dielectric layer 202b; and a third resonator 208b on the first dielectric layer coupled to the second resonator and cross coupled to the first resonator; an input transmission line 207a connected to the first resonator; and an output transmission line 207b connected to the third resonator; and two ground planes 200, 203 are provided on upper and bottom planes. It should be noted that "a third resonator located on a third layer of dielectric material" as recited in claims 1, 13 and 25 has been assumed as the third resonator located at the first layer of dielectric material (see applicant's drawing, fig. 4).

Peters does not show a voltage variable capacitor is coupled to at least one of the resonators. Liang et al. (figs. 6-9) discloses a similar combline filter having voltage variable capacitors coupled to resonators to tune each resonant frequency or the center frequency of the filter. Moreover, Liang et al. also suggests using MEMS varactors as a variable capacitor (col. 10, lines 20-48).

Application/Control Number: 10/757,314

Art Unit: 2817

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide a voltage tunable variable capacitors or MEMS varactors of Liang et al. in the device of Peters to tune in different frequencies (including the center frequency) for fast tuning capability, small size as well as improve the insertion loss as shown by Liang et al. (col. 5, lines 11-26, col. 6, lines 45-67, for MEM varactors, col. 10, lines 20-48).

The subject matter of claims 8 and 20 cannot be given any patentable weight since it is unclear as what would be constitute as "the remainder of the resonators".

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on May 17, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claims 8 and 20, examiner requests to cancel claims 8 and 20 (see REMARKS, p. 9, fifth paragraph).

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references (see REMARKS, page 10 and 11, Part IV), the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Liang et al. discloses a similar combline bandpass filter (fig. 6) having a voltage tunable variable capacitor (including MEM varactors) coupled to a resonator to tune in different frequencies. Liang et al. also teaches voltage variable

capacitors or MEM varactors provide fast tuning capability, small size, low insertion loss, etc. (see col. 5, lines 11-26, col. 6, lines 45-67, for MEM varactors, col. 10, lines 20-48). Therefore, it is the examiner's position that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide a voltage tunable variable capacitors or MEMS varactors of Liang et al. in the device of Peters to tune in different frequencies for the advantages that taught by Liang et al. Moreover, Liang et al. teaches that tunable duplexers (e.g., filters) can cover larger frequency band than fixed duplexers (col. 9, line 63 – col. 10, line 6).

It should be noted that the applicant amended the independent claims 1 and 13, by inserting "voltage tunable" variable capacitor. Thus, whether providing a variable capacitor in a resonator to tune a resonant frequency is well known in the art is moot. However, the examiner includes Pickett and Tsuda references which shows a voltage tunable bandpass filter having a voltage-tunable variable capacitor/diode coupled to a resonator.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Pickett and Tsuda disclose a tunable filter having a voltage tunable capacitor coupled to a resonator; and

Allison et al. (fig. 7) and Kwon et al. disclose a tunable filter having MEM varactors coupled to a resonator.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Seungsook Ham whose telephone number is (571) 272-2405. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 8:00AM-5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Pascal can be reached on (571)-272-1769. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **571-273-8300**.

Art Unit: 2817

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Seungsook Ham Primary Examiner Art Unit 2817

sh